United States District Court Southern District of New York

United States of America

JUDN NAVALLO Defendant CASE NO: 20-CT-502-1(KMK)

[Emergency notion in support of sentence modification Pursuant to 18 U.S.C § 3582(c) 2]

Southern District of New York ) SS:

#### AFFIRMATION

TUDN NAVATTO Defendant | AFFIANT, pro se, pursuant to 28 U.S.C & 1746, hereby being duly sworn, deposes and affirms;

### Preamble

I JUAN NAVACTO, here after (Petitioner) Named in the above entitled style and number caption serving 60 months sentence in Lewisburg Stillite Camp in Pennsylvania, Based on my own recolection of events, I'm competent to attest to the material facts ascertained in this affidavit - motion as it relates to Lewisburg FCI (BOP computation of sentence pursuant to court order dated 2/16/24.

2. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C § 3582(C) this Honorable court

granted petitioner a sentence reduction of 6 months, taking the courts intially imposed sentence of 66 months to 60 months.

- 3. To date more than a year from the courts ruling Lewisburg FCI | Bot has not provided petitioner with an updated sentence computation to reflect his reduction in sentence.
- 4. Every team "neeting with case manager (Mr. Rich), after reduction was granted Petitioner attempted to get his sentence compotation corrected only to be told nothing needed to be done on his end he's aware of the court order his date will be updated.
- 4. Considering Lewisburg FCI | Bops failure to update Petitioner's sentence compotation, not adhering to this honorable courts instructions provides a clear and positive showing of futility exhaustion must be waived. See Rose V. Lundy 455 U.S. 509, 516 N.7102 S.CT. 1198 71 L. Ed. 2d
- 5. Retitioner is humbily requesting the court to intervene to preserve its previous ruling in granting his 6 months sentence reduction by ordering his sentence to time served with a modification of supervised release to include home confinement to an amount of time this honorable court deems necessary, 18 U.S.C § 3582(CXIXA)(i)

# Argument

6. Considering Lewisburg FCT | BOP HAS Ignored this Honorable courts ruling in providing petitioner a 6 month reduction in sentence the court should grant relief pursuant to 18 U.S.C & 3582(C)(1)(A)(1)

## Legal Standard

Under 18 U.S.C & 3582(C)(1)(A), Congress permits
District Courts to exercise discretion to reduce a
term of imprisonment and "impose a term of probation
or supervised release with or without conditions" if,
1) the incarcerated movement meets administrative
exhaustion requirements, 2) "extraordinary and
compelling reasons" warrant a reduction, 3) the
reduction would be consistent with any applicable
policy statements issued by the sentencing commission
and 4) the applicable sentencing factors under

7. Retitioner asserts Lewisburg FCI/BOP's failure to timely comply with this Honorable courts ruling provides "extraordinary and compelling" reason to warrant relief under 18 U.S. C § 3582(C)(1)(A)

8. The Bureau of Prisons refusal to comply with this courts ruling leaves petitioner without the benifit to fully participate in reentry programs and transitional serices such as Home confinement. 9. Petitioner being less than comouths away to what should be his statutory release date, Lewisburg FCI/BOP hasn't updated his sentence computation or had him sign a referral preket for prerelease custody, Without court intervention the likely event is Retitioner staying past his Statutory release date in [carceral] eustody. 10. Considering Petitioner has now served 46 Months of his 51 month sentence (after good time) a reduction in his sentence at this juncture will still allow the court to impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary .

11. The same relevant section 3553(9) factors that weighed in Petitioner's favor for this Honorable court to grant relief under 18 U.S.C & 3582(C)(2) also supports relief under 18 U.S.C & 3582(C)(1)(A)

12. Based on all the above the court should now impose a reduced sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary in compliance with section 3553(a), to promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, and protect the public from further crimes. See united states V. Kimbrough 128 SiCT 558, 570 (2000) holding that section 3553(a) "as modified by Booker, contains an over reaching - instructing district courts to imposes a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary to accomplish the goal at sentencing",

13. In writing this petition pursuant to 180.5.63
3582(c)(1)(A), Retitioner was denied access to
Law library, Copy machine and type writer of the
entire camp population here at Lewisburg FCI has
been on lock down for 3 weeks and counting,
bespite the unwarranted group punishment phaced
on petitioner hopefully I was still able to bring
forth an argument based in the plain language of
18 U.S.C & 3582(c) and relevant case law.

Conclusion

Retitioner Knows the Lord hears when you pray and responds when you pray for this reason asking this court to provide the relief he seeks.

### Declaration

Thereby declare under penalty of persung that the above statements of fact are true and correct to the best of my knowledge 18 U.S.C § 1621(2)

Respectfully submitted

Juan Navooro
3/16/25

The Motion for Re-computation of the sentence is denied as moot. As the Government notes in its response dated April 1, 2015 (see Dkt. No. 65), BOP has recalculated Mr. Navarro's sentence based on the Court's order of February 19, 2024 to reduce his sentence from 66 to 60 months' imprisonment. The Motion for Compassionate Release also is denied. Mr. Navarro offers no compelling reasons for an early release and the Court concludes that any further reduction would not be appropriate after consideration of the Section 3553(a) factors. In particular, a further reduction would dilute respect for the law, given the seriousness of the criminal conduct, and adversely affect general deterrence.

So Ordered

WIED 19 MAR 2025PM

Inmate Name:\_



United States District court White Plains New York 1060 Southern District of New York

